

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by La Medica, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 6,625,451 "Medica"). Medica discloses a preferred roaming list and system select feature.

Each of independent Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 of the present application recites a "valid roaming list" and a "stored roaming list". A valid roaming list contains system ID information of sub-PLMNs (or mobile switching centers (MSC)) whose roaming services can be provided in a mobile station's current location, i.e. based on a physical location of the mobile station, and is generated from previously stored system ID information of peripheral sub-PLMNs, as set forth on page 10 of the Specification. A sub-PLMN to which a mobile station belongs provides the valid roaming list containing the system ID information of sub-PLMNs whose roaming services can be provided, and the MS compares a previously stored roaming list with the received valid roaming list to determine whether a scan procedure should be performed, thereby eliminating an unnecessary operation and saving power of the MS. The valid roaming list contains system IDs of only those sub-PLMNs that can transmit/receive in a particular, geometric region. As the geometric region changes (or as the mobile station moves to different regions), the valid roaming list is changed by the MSC based on sub-PLMNs that can transmit in the different geometric regions.

The Examiner equates an SID or list of SIDs of Medica to the valid roaming list of the present application. Although there are various compilations of SIDs in Medica, none of the compilations (i.e. lists) are based on a geometric location. In the home only mode, the SID list contains SIDs of all of the home systems; no geometric distinctions are made. In the PRL only mode a list of SIDs of preferred systems is constructed. The preferred list contains the SIDs of other systems operated by the customer's provider or with which that provider has established a roaming agreement, as disclosed at col. 13, lines 36-40; no geometric distinctions are made. The lists generated by Medica are not based on a geometric location.

The mobile stations of the claims of the present application do not need to determine if a

home or preferred system is available, as this information is provided in the valid roaming list. As stated in Medica and as cited by the Examiner in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Medica mobile station in the home only mode “detects SIDs identifying the systems available over the air”, and in the PRL only mode the mobile station “again scans for the SID.” These scans by the mobile station are required by the Medica device in order to identify the SIDs of the available systems. This process of scanning by the mobile station for available system SIDs is avoided in the claims of the present application since it is the mobile switching center that determines the available systems based on the geometric setup of the system, creates the valid roaming list containing the SIDs of the available systems, and transmits the valid roaming list to the mobile station for use in performing the roaming procedure.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 is respectfully requested.


Further with respect to Claims 1, 5 and 7, these claims go on to recite that a mobile switching center identifies a current location of a mobile station, and configures the valid roaming list including system IDs of peripheral sub-PLMNs whose roaming services can be provided according to the current location of the mobile station. Since a mobile switching center of Medica is not involved in a process such as this, the mobile switching center of Medica does not identify a current location of a mobile station, and configure the valid roaming list according to the current location of the mobile station. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 5 and 7 is respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 3 and 6, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2, 3 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Musella", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael J. Musella
Reg. No. 39,310
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr